

Remarks

The Examiner has rejected claims 11-15 and claims 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. patent 6,312,124 issued Desormeaux, hereinafter referred to as Desormeaux. The Applicants respectfully request careful consideration of the following arguments in support of overcoming the Examiner's rejections.

Rejections of Claims 11-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The amended claim 11 includes the limitations of "the *radiated signal indicative of a position* of the imaging mechanism relative to a reference point." (emphasis added) Support for this amendment can be found, for example, on page 4, line 29 through page 5, line 10, page 12, line 30 through page 13, line 5, and elsewhere in the originally filed application. The Examiner contends, as indicated on page 3 of the office action, that "emitting device" reads upon "host computer 62" and that "host computer 62" is "configured to emit a signal". The Applicants could not locate disclosure in Desormeaux that teaches or suggests that "host computer 62" includes a configuration to emit "the radiated signal indicative of a position of the imaging mechanism relative to a reference point" as limitations of the amended claim 11 recite. Therefore, the Applicants believe the amended claim 11 is not anticipated by Desormeaux.

Claims 12-15 are dependent upon the amended claim 11 and incorporate by reference all the limitations of the amended claim 11. Therefore, claims 12-15 are not anticipated by Desormeaux. Because Desormeaux does not anticipate the amended claim 11, and claims 12-15 are dependent upon the amended claim 11, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 11-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Rejections of Claim 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The amended claim 19 includes the limitations of "a *radiated signal Indicative of a position* of the manual imaging device relative to a reference point". (emphasis added) Support for this amendment can be found, for example, on page 4, line 29 through page 5, line 10, page 12, line 30 through page 13, line 5, and elsewhere in the originally filed application. The Examiner, contends, as indicated on page 5 of the office action, that "inherent in the printer 60" is a "receiving element" "arranged to receive a position signal

S/N: 09/692,844  
Case: 10004382-1

(from sensor 120). The Applicants could not locate disclosure in Desormeaux that teaches that "sensor 120" provides "a radiated signal indicative of a position of the manual imaging device relative to a reference point".

Claim 20 is dependent upon the amended claim 19 and incorporates by reference all the limitations of the amended claim 19. Therefore, claim 20 is not anticipated by Desormeaux. Because Desormeaux does not anticipate the amended claim 19, and claim 20 is dependent upon claim 19, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Objections to Claims 16-18 and 21

The Examiner has indicated that claims 16-18 and 21 include allowable subject matter but has objected to them as dependent upon rejected claims. The Applicants contend that the amendment to claim 11 overcomes the objections to claim 16-18 because the amendments to claim 11 have overcome the rejections to claims 11-15. The Applicants contend that the amendment to claim 19 overcomes the objections to claim 21 because the amendments to claim 19 have overcome the rejections to claims 19 and 20.

Amendments to Claims 13, 16, 17, 18, and 21

Claims 13, 16, 17, 18, and 21 have been amended so that they are consistent with the claims upon which they depend.

Conclusion

The Applicants contend that the amendments to the claims place the application in a condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

James P. Slupe, et al.

By Gregg W. Wisdom

Gregg W. Wisdom

Reg. No. 40,231

February 23, 2005

(360) 212-8052

S/N: 09/692,844  
Case: 10004382-1